

Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

Due: September 1, 2003



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)

STATE RESPONSE

The New Hampshire Department of Education is working on developing English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for grades K-12 with Dr. Margot Gottlieb, Tim Boals, and other members of the WIDA (Wisconsin, Delaware, and Arkansas) Consortium and with Professor Judith Sharkey at the University of New Hampshire. The NH Department of Education is also collaborating with other northern New England states that are members of the New England Compact, which was awarded a federal Enhanced Assessment Instrument grant in 2002. As part of this group, New Hampshire has recently signed on with the WIDA Consortium and will be provided with:

- English Language Proficiency Standards in the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing for four grade-level clusters (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12) at 5 proficiency levels (beginning, emerging, developing, expanding, advancing)
- ELP Standards with six areas of English Language Proficiency (school-based language, content-based language, Language Arts academic proficiency, math academic proficiency, science academic proficiency, and social studies academic proficiency) and 120 unique Progress Indicators for each English Language Proficiency Standard (20 per language proficiency area, 24 per language proficiency level, and 30 for each grade level cluster)
- English language screening tests for entry and exit
- Two tiers of secured proficiency tests, Tier I covering language proficiency levels 1-2 and Tier II covering language proficiency level 3-5
- Relevant professional development, pilot and field testing, development of test items

The English Language Proficiency Standards will align with New Hampshire's state academic standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and, by 2005-06, in science. Please see Alignment Chart sample developed by Dr. Sharkey that is attached electronically in the State's Appendix A.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. **English language proficiency** baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

Baseline Data for 2002-2003					
ELP Assessment(s)	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3,332 Tested with the IPT	2997	216	2781	N/A	335*
		7%	83%	N/A	10%*

* Some students who have been exited from ESL instructional programs after attaining proficiency were not tested in spring 2003.

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) published by Ballard & Tighe

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

Please see chart above.

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Please see chart above for the number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency. The ELP assessment presently being used, the IPT, has 3 levels: non-fluent, limited, fluent/competent. Level 3 (Level 4 on the federal chart below) is the Proficient Level (referred to in New Hampshire as "Proficient," "Fluent," or "Competent"). All data have been aggregated at the State level. The state is not reporting data using an ELP composite score, utilizing methods of weighting or averaging scores. Each level is the sum of children scoring on that level. The Level 2 or Limited level is composed of students who are limited in one or more domain. Comprehension in higher level listening and reading skills could not be assessed at this time. Please see the information regarding this under Section 3122(a)(3) below.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

**IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT), Oral Language, grades K-6, listening and speaking
IPT, Oral Language, grades 7-12, listening and speaking
IPT Early Literacy Reading Test, grades K-1, reading
IPT Early Literacy Writing Test, grades K-1, writing
IPT 1 Reading Test, grades 2-3, reading
IPT 1 Writing Test, grades 2-3, writing
IPT, grades 4-6, reading
IPT, grades 4-6, writing
IPT, grades 7-12, reading
IPT, grades 7-12, writing**

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

3,332 students were assessed for English language proficiency using the IPT.

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

2997 students were identified as LEP in English language Proficiency using the IPT.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments
- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.

STATE RESPONSE

The State's definition of proficiency follows:

"Attaining fluency/competency in the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as well as higher-level listening and reading comprehension so that the English language student achieves in the 50th percentile or better in the mainstream classroom."

The State's test cut scores follow the guidelines of the IPT designations chart for each grade level (fall K, spring K, 1st grade, 2nd grade, 3rd grade, etc.). Students attaining proficiency will achieve the score listed below or better in the four domains tested by the IPT.

IPT Oral, grades K-6, listening and speaking--K: Level D; Gr. 1: Level E; Gr. 2-6: Level F (with IPT Level A being the lowest and IPT Level F being the highest)

IPT Oral, grades 7-12, listening and speaking--Gr. 7-12: Level F

IPT Early Literacy Reading Test, grades K-1, reading--spring K: score of 38; Gr. 1: score of 58

IPT Early Literacy Writing Test, grades K-1, writing--spring K: score of 14; Gr. 1: score of 20

IPT 1 Reading Test, grades 2-3, reading--Gr. 2: score of 36; Gr. 3: score of 41

IPT 1 Writing Test, grades 2-3, writing--score of 9 (without Reading/Writing Conventions)

IPT, grades 4-6, reading--Gr. 4-5: score of 36; Gr. 6: score of 41

IPT, grades 4-6, writing--score of 9 (without Reading/Writing Conventions)

IPT, grades 7-12, reading--score of 41

IPT, grades 7-12, writing--score of 9 (without Reading/Writing Conventions)

The IPT Reading/Writing Conventions of basic punctuation, capitalization, etc. is not included in the writing score because a high score on the Conventions section can distort the scores on the writing prompts, making the student appear to be more proficient in writing than s/he is.

The five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated in the State's definition of "proficient" in English. The student must attain fluency/competency in English in the four domains, plus higher-level listening and reading comprehension (interpretation, inference, and application) in order to be considered proficient. Since the IPT is limited in its scope in evaluating higher level comprehension skills, the State is investigating tests that assess higher-level listening skills, such as the MELA-Oral published by the Massachusetts Department of Education. For higher-level reading comprehension, the State is considering tests published by Riverside, CTB McGraw-Hill, Gates-MacGinitie, and a testing system being developed by the New England Compact and the WIDA (Wisconsin, Delaware, Arkansas) Consortium.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments
- A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)
- A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next

STATE RESPONSE

The English language proficiency levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments currently being developed are:

- Beginning—demonstrates comprehension through actions & gestures, with receptive and some limited expressive vocabulary; recognizes basics of print concepts, letters and letter-sound connection; uses pictures to comprehend text; reads some short sentences
- Emerging—continuing to use actions & gestures and develop receptive & expressive vocabulary; can use letter-sound connection to sound out new words; begins to use word structures to decode; comprehend, and write simple sentences
- Developing—able to respond to questions and converse in English using simple phrases & sentences; uses phonics, grammar and context to construct meaning; identifies main ideas; engages in silent reading; and can write a draft that has a clear, central idea
- Expanding—Responds to questions and converses in English using more complex phrases and sentences; reads a variety of genres; writes for different purposes
- Advancing—Identifies point of view from an oral reading; uses a variety of verbal & nonverbal strategies to convey meaning and self-correct in communications; can apply appropriate reading and writing strategies across a variety of subject areas
- Attainment —Performs in the four domains and in higher-level listening and reading comprehension on the 50th percentile or better in mainstream classroom with same-age peers

Students making progress in learning English will move from one stage of proficiency to the next, which will be reflected in the IPT and a variety of periodic assessments. Please see Appendix B-Overview of Stages of English Language Proficiency, which is electronically attached.

The criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next is still being developed. Presently, the criteria is to score the lowest cut-off score or better for an IPT designation (e.g., moving from level A on the IPT-Oral to level B, etc. for each year of listening/speaking instruction; 5 raw score points for each year of instruction in reading, and 1 rubric level for each year of instruction in writing). The criteria will be finalized once the State's ELP Standards are completed and an assessment is found that tests higher-level comprehension as well as the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. The WIDA Consortium and the New England Compact are developing an effective tool to assess the four domains and comprehension. Attainment in English language proficiency will be determined by the student's reaching the lowest cut-off score or better for fluency/competency on the IPT, and performing in the 50th percentile or better on reading comprehension and other achievement tests given to same-grade peers in the mainstream classroom.

The language domains students must currently make progress in when moving from one English language proficiency level to the next are in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Please see Appendix B for the "General Descriptions: Language Domains." As stated above, criteria for the State are being expanded and developed.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

**The cohorts for the State of New Hampshire are:
Specific groups of English language students who share background or learning characteristics.
The cohorts in this submission are by grade clusters:**

- K-1
- 2-3
- 4-6
- 7-12

The characteristics of the cohorts are self-explanatory. These cohorts are aligned with the Idea Proficiency Test. It is anticipated that these cohorts will change in the future and more closely align with the work of the Wisconsin/Delaware/Arkansas (WIDA) Coalition's grade clusters (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12) and may also include a cohort for "formal years of schooling in the country of origin".

Because this is the first year New Hampshire has gathered data on English language proficiency by cohort, the state has no previous data with which to compare 2002-03 data. Thus, the percentages in each grade cluster cohort listed below are estimates for both progress and attainment in English language proficiency. It is anticipated, based on current data, that English language students in New Hampshire will make progress in English proficiency according to the percentages listed below. But older students in cohort Grade Clusters 2-3, 4-6, and 7-12, without the benefit of Kindergarten and/or 1st grade in the US and/or disadvantaged by limited formal schooling (LFS), may make progress within a 7-year span rather than a 5-year span. For research supporting this, see English Language Acquisition research reported by Doctors Stephen Krashen, James Cummins, Catherine Collier, and Virginia Collier.

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: Grade Cluster K-1**

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans) **In 2002-03 School Year, 6 % attained English Language Proficiency in K-1 cluster.**

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	75% in cluster	12%
2004-2005 School Year	80% in cluster	20%
2005-2006 School Year	85% in cluster	40%
2006-2007 School Year	90% in cluster	70%
2007-2008 School Year	95% in cluster	95%

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: Grade Cluster 2-3**

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans) **In 2002-03 School Year, 12% attained English Language Proficiency in this cluster.**

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	65% in cluster	20%
2004-2005 School Year	70% in cluster	40%
2005-2006 School Year	75% in cluster	60%
2006-2007 School Year	80% in cluster	70%
2007-2008 School Year	85% in cluster	85%
2008-2009 School Year	90% in cluster	90%
2009-2010 School Year	95% in cluster	95%

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: Grade Cluster 4-6**

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans) **In 2002-03 School Year, 14 % attained English Language Proficiency in this cluster.**

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	65% in cluster	30%
2004-2005 School Year	70% in cluster	50%
2005-2006 School Year	75% in cluster	70%
2006-2007 School Year	80% in cluster	80%
2007-2008 School Year	85% in cluster	85%
2008-2009 School Year	90% in cluster	90%
2009-2010 School Year	95% in cluster	95%

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: Grade Cluster 7-12**

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans) **In 2002-03 School Year, 8 % attained English Language Proficiency in this cluster. (Please note: LEP students may attend school until their 21st birthday.)**

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	65% in cluster	15%
2004-2005 School Year	70% in cluster	30%
2005-2006 School Year	75% in cluster	60%
2006-2007 School Year	80% in cluster	75%
2007-2008 School Year	85% in cluster	85%
2008-2009 School Year	90% in cluster	90%
2009-2010 School Year	95% in cluster	95%

Please note that many students who have attained proficiency in the last two years and have been fully mainstreamed in regular classrooms were not tested in the spring of 2003. Please see the baseline data chart for Performance Indicator 2.1.

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	86	84
2003-2004 Target	90	89
2004-2005 Target	95	95
2005-2006 Target	100	100

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State’s definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

1. *The teacher is certified in each of the core academic content area(s) taught (through Alternatives I through V.)* **OR**

2. *The teacher is an intern holding a bachelor’s degree making progress in Alternative Certification IV or V in the core academic content area(s) taught.*

OR

3. The teacher is certified but not in the core academic content area(s) taught, and the teacher has accomplished one of the following for each core academic subject taught:

Demonstration of Competency Options

(A) successfully demonstrated competency by passing a rigorous State academic subject test in each of the core academic subjects in which the teacher teaches (which may consist of a passing level of performance on a State-required certification or licensing test or test in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches); **[Tests: Praxis II Content Area, GRE Content Area]**
OR

(B)) successfully completed, in each of the core academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, an academic major at the undergraduate or graduate level, coursework equivalent to an undergraduate academic major (30 credit hours in core academic subject), or advanced certification or credentialing such as Master Teacher;
OR

(C) successfully demonstrated competence in all core academic subjects in which the teacher teaches based on (a) a self-assessment component of a High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE), or (b) by demonstrating progress toward competency in a core academic content area on a Highly Qualified Teacher Plan (HQT plan) incorporated into the Individual Professional Development Plan prescribed by the local Professional Development Master Plan(ED 512). The process for NH HOUSSE may be found at http://www.ed.state.nh.us/ProfessionalDevelopment/HQT/Toolkit_Parts.htm .

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIlguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	75
2003-2004 Target	85
2004-2005 Target	95
2005-2006 Target	100

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	54
2003-2004 Target	65
2004-2005 Target	80
2005-2006 Target	100

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students												
African American/Black												
American Indian/Native Alaskan												
Asian/Pacific Islander												
Hispanic												
White												
Other												
Students with Disabilities												
Students without Disabilities												
Limited English Proficient												
Economically Disadvantaged												
Non-Economically Disadvantaged												
Migrant												
Male												
Female												

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students												
African American/Black												
American Indian/Native Alaskan												
Asian/Pacific Islander												
Hispanic												
White												
Other												
Students with Disabilities												
Students without Disabilities												
Limited English Proficient												
Economically Disadvantaged												
Non-Economically Disadvantaged												
Migrant												
Male												
Female												